

# Delayed reactive distractor suppression in aging populations

Ashinoff, Brandon; Geng, Joy; Mevorach, Carmel

DOI:  
[10.1037/pag0000336](https://doi.org/10.1037/pag0000336)

License:  
None: All rights reserved

Document Version  
Peer reviewed version

Citation for published version (Harvard):  
Ashinoff, B, Geng, J & Mevorach, C 2019, 'Delayed reactive distractor suppression in aging populations', *Psychology and Aging*, vol. 34, no. 3, pp. 418-430. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pag0000336>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

**Publisher Rights Statement:**  
Checked for eligibility 06/02/2019

©American Psychological Association, 2019. This paper is not the copy of record and may not exactly replicate the authoritative document published in the APA journal. Please do not copy or cite without author's permission. The final article is available, upon publication, at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/pag0000336>

Copyright 2019 APA, all rights reserved

## General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

## Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact [UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk](mailto:UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk) providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

## Delayed Reactive Distractor Suppression in Aging Populations

Brandon K. Ashinoff

University of Birmingham and Columbia University

Joy Geng

University of California - Davis

Carmel Mevorach

University of Birmingham

### Authors Note:

Brandon K. Ashinoff, School of Psychology and Centre for Human Brain Health, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, United Kingdom; Department of Psychiatry, Columbia University; Joy Geng, Department of Psychology, University of California – Davis; Carmel Mevorach, School of Psychology and Centre for Human Brain Health, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, United Kingdom. Correspondence regarding this manuscript should be addressed to Brandon K. Ashinoff: bka2115@cumc.columbia.edu.

The authors would like to thank Denise Clissett for her critical role in the recruitment of older participants, as well as Samantha Ellis, Charlie-Louise Milward, and Leah Supra for their contributions to this project as undergraduate research assistants.

This paper is based on chapter 3 of author B.K.A.'s dissertation (Ashinoff, 2017). All raw data and experimental code for this study is publicly available on the Open Science Framework (OSF):

<https://osf.io/3h7ux/>

Date: 05/02/2019 – This manuscript has not been published yet.

### **Abstract**

Previous studies have tended to infer that reactive control is intact in aging populations because of evidence that proactive control is impaired and that older participants appear to favor reactive control strategies. However, most of these studies did not compare reactive control in young and older participants directly. In our study, a young (18-21 years old) and older (60 + years old) cohort engaged in a task that assesses reactive distractor suppression where subjects had to discriminate between an upright and inverted t-shape in the presence of a salient or non-salient distractor. In previous studies using this paradigm (DiQuattro and Geng, 2010) young participants reactively used the salient distractor as an anti-cue and performed better (faster RT and higher accuracy) when it was present. It was found that older participants were not able to reactively suppress the salient distractor with a 200 msec display but were able to do so with a 600 msec display. It was concluded that the initiation of reactive suppression is delayed for older participants, but that effective suppression is possible given enough time.

Keywords: Cognitive Aging, Cognitive Control, Distractor Suppression, Reactive Control, Salience Suppression

## Introduction

It is generally accepted that normal aging can lead to declines in cognitive performance (Braver and Barch, 2002; Craik and Salthouse, 2011; Andrews-Hannah et al, 2007; Geerligs et al, 2014a; 2014b; Grady, 2012; Larson et al, 2016; Li et al, 2001; 2016; Persson et al, 2006; Zanto et al, 2010). More specifically, there is a plethora of evidence highlighting impairments in inhibition mechanisms (Hasher and Zacks, 1988; Bauer et al, 2012; Mayas et al, 2012; Gazzaley et al, 2005; but see Frings et al, 2015 for contrasting findings). Previous studies have highlighted the increased interference experienced from irrelevant distractors in old age across different experimental paradigms such as global/local tasks (Tsvetanov et al, 2013; Mevorach et al, 2016), reading with distractor tasks (Darowski et al, 2008), response inhibition (Anguera and Gazzaley, 2012), as well as inhibition in the context of WM tasks (Gazzaley et al, 2005). These findings and others fit with the notion that aging is associated with a general impairment in a central inhibition mechanism (the inhibitory deficit theory; Hasher and Zacks, 1988), which manifests in various inhibition related scenarios. The focus on inhibitory processes in old age is especially relevant because there is evidence that distractor inhibition is crucial in mediating cognitive control in general (Darowski et al., 2008). It should be noted that although it is often assumed that inhibition deficits result in impaired cognition, there is some evidence to suggest that it may improve cognition under some circumstances (Amer, Campbell, and Hasher, 2016).

In contrast, the notion that an all-encompassing inhibition impairment is associated with age has been challenged by studies showing impairments only on subsets of inhibition tasks (Rey-Mermet et al, 2018a; 2018b). For instance, Kramer et al (1994) found age related inhibition deficits in a stop-signal task, but not in a response competition or spatial pre-cueing task. Furthermore, even when inhibition impairments occur across tasks, evidence suggests they may be independent. For instance, Anguera and Gazzaley (2012; Sebastian et al, 2013) assessed motor inhibition in a stop signal task and sensory filtering within the context of a delayed recognition task in young and old participants. Critically, they showed that motor and sensory inhibition were independently impaired

as a function of aging. More recent studies have built upon this conclusion, further highlighting distinct age effects on different cognitive inhibitory functions and their potential neural correlates (Vadaga et al, 2015; Bloemendaal et al, 2016).

The dual mechanisms theory of proactive and reactive cognitive control (Braver, 2012) suggests a potential explanation for the failure to identify a general inhibition impairment in old age. Rather than a single inhibition mechanism, the DMC differentiates between two modes of control: Proactive, an attentional biasing mechanism which mediates behavioral responses to a given stimulus in advance; and reactive, which is a “late correction” mechanism that allows one to alter behavioral plans “in the moment” when suddenly presented with new and relevant information. Consequently, it is possible that only one of these inhibition mechanisms is affected by age, or that they are affected to different degrees. Indeed, previous studies have identified a proactive pattern of performance in young participants and a reactive one in old participants (Braver et al., 2005; Paxton et al, 2008). Interestingly, even when performance across age groups was equivalent, brain activity that was consistent with impairments to proactive control (Vadaga et al, 2015) and increased reliance on reactive control (Paxton et al., 2008) was documented in the older cohorts. Similar brain dynamics have also been recorded in the context of a task switching paradigm as older participants (relative to younger participants) showed reduced sustained activation, a hallmark of proactive control (Braver, 2012), and increased transient activation, a hallmark of reactive control (Braver, 2012), during switch trials in the anterior prefrontal cortex (Jimura and Braver 2010). These findings are consistent with the idea that older participants show more reactive control related- and less proactive control related activity than younger participants.

The above evidence points to a selective impairment in inhibition in old age – proactive processes appear to decline with age, while reactive processes may be intact. However, there are two major issues with this interpretation. First, most studies of the DMC and aging have highlighted the activation of reactive processes in older participants and proactive process in young participants

in the same task, but did not directly compare reactive processes across age groups. Second, in many of these studies (typically using the AxCPT paradigm; Braver et al, 2005; Paxton et al, 2008; Braver et al, 2009) utilising either proactive or reactive control yield different performance benefits. As such, it is possible that the increased use of reactive control in old age represents an unconscious strategic bias rather than specific impairment in proactive control and intact reactive control. For example, one of the early examples for inhibition deficits was reported by Hasher et al (1991) in a study measuring inhibitory function in young and older participants using a negative priming task (assessing the persistence of inhibition of a distractor by switching its role to a target on subsequent trials). Hasher et al (1991) found that young participants showed persistence of inhibition from one trial to the next, but older participants showed no effects, suggesting impaired inhibitory function. They argued that this reflected impairment in a central inhibition mechanism. However, an alternative interpretation is that the younger participants were engaging proactive control and that the persistence of inhibition was an artifact of their anticipating the state of the target and distractor items, whereas older participants engaged reactive control and therefore did not show negative priming because they didn't anticipate their state. Crucially, this arguably conferred a strategic benefit to the older participants in this context since they were not biased away from the target on switch trials.

A few notable studies have addressed the issue of comparing reactive control between age groups. One set of studies have focused on "proportion congruence" manipulations in conflict resolution tasks, such as Stroop tasks where congruent (no-conflict) and incongruent (conflict) displays are contrasted (Bugg and Crump, 2012; also see Bugg, 2015 for examples using a flanker task). Proportion congruence studies manipulate the ratio of congruent and incongruent trials within a block (list-wise) or for a specific target type (item-specific; e.g., dogs within a list of animals) and measure how such changes in frequency modulate performance differences between the congruent and incongruent conditions. The typical finding in such studies with young adults is that the congruency effects (difference in performance between congruent and incongruent displays) are

larger in the condition with more congruent trials, than in the condition with more incongruent trials (Bugg and Chahani, 2011; Bugg, Jacobi, and Chahani, 2011; Bugg, Jacoby, and Toth, 2008). Importantly, the two versions of this paradigm (list-wide and item-specific) arguably tap proactive and reactive control mechanisms, separately. List-wide manipulations enable participants to adopt a more stringent control in anticipation of trials throughout a block (proactive), while item-specific versions do not. In the latter case, the proportion congruence manipulation is applied to different items that are randomly intermixed and therefore, whether more or less stringent control is needed cannot be predicted before an item is presented (reactive). In fact, Gonthier et al (2016) showed distinct doubly-dissociated behavioral signatures for item-specific (reactive) vs list-wise (proactive) proportion congruence manipulations, supporting the notion that item-specific proportion congruence manipulations tap into reactive control mechanisms. Using such paradigms, Bugg et al (2014a; 2014b) compared performance of young and old adults. Specifically, Bugg et al., (2014b) found that both young and older participants exhibited the standard item-specific proportion congruence effect, where the mostly congruent items had larger congruency effects than the mostly incongruent items. Since reactive control was argued to be necessary to produce this effect, Bugg et al (2014b) concluded that reactive control was spared in older participants.

Much like the “item-specific” proportion congruency effect, “sequential” congruency effects have also been used as a measure of reactive control. “Sequential” congruency effects refer to the phenomenon that congruency effects for trials immediately following an incongruent trial are reduced compared to congruency effects for trials immediately following a congruent trial (In other words, analyzing trials  $n+1$  and grouping them based on trial  $n$ ). Typically, both young and older participants show these sequential congruency effects of equal magnitude, but older participants show overall larger congruency effects and longer overall response times (even after accounting for speed of processing deficits; Puccioni & Vallesi, 2012; West & Moore, 2005; but see Aschenbrenner and Balota, 2016 for a study where older participants showed a larger sequential congruency effect). In other words, although older participants seem to take longer to complete the task, these studies

have suggested that reactive control is effectively intact in older cohorts. In contrast, Xiang et al (2016) found no “sequential” congruency effects for older participants, with respect to both response time and accuracy, arguing that reactive control might be impaired in aging. However, they did not account for generalized slowing effects or speed-accuracy trade-offs, which makes their results difficult to interpret.

The purpose of this study is to further assess reactive distractor suppression in aging populations. It should be noted here that reactive and proactive cognitive control are essentially umbrella terms that can refer to two different mechanisms of engaging a wide range of similar cognitive abilities, including distractor suppression, target selection, conflict resolution, and so on. Despite this, most studies tend to use the general term of proactive or reactive control, rather than specify the cognitive mechanisms being investigated. This is relevant because it may be that proactive and reactive control of some cognitive abilities may be intact, while others may be impaired. Although the DMC generally argues for a general impairment within proactive control mechanisms, it may be valuable to adopt a more precise perspective. Therefore, we refer to the process of reactive distractor suppression throughout our study, rather than reactive control.

In order to stringently assess age-related differences in reactive distractor suppression, performance should be compared in a task that yields clear benefits when reactive distractor suppression is engaged and eliminates or significantly reduces the role of proactive distractor suppression in young participants too. Here, we describe such a task which specifically taps reactive distractor suppression mechanisms. DiQuattro and Geng (2011) investigated the brain mechanisms that are involved in processing contextually relevant, but not task relevant stimuli. While in an fMRI scanner, they had participants (Mean age = 23.8; Age Range: 18 – 39 yrs) perform a visual search task for a low contrast target in the presence of either a high or low contrast non-target (50% predictability), each of which would appear in one of two pre-defined locations; participants could not predict the location of the distractor on a given trial. Despite being task irrelevant, the salient



non-target was contextually relevant as the presence of the high contrast non-target informed the participant that the target was in the other location, effectively triggering a reactive distractor suppression. They found that participants were both faster and more accurate on trials with a salient distractor, compared to a similar (to the target) distractor.

Geng and DiQuattro (2010; experiment 1) used a variant of this paradigm with eye tracking showing that, when the distractor was unpredictable, participants made a saccade to distractor first on ~68% of trials, necessitating reactive rapid rejection instead of proactively inhibiting the distractor (saccading towards the target first; for similar trials, it was ~50% rapid rejection and ~50% inhibition). They argued that rapid rejection was only needed when inhibition failed. In other words, the engagement of reactive control in this task pre-supposes a failure of proactive control (Geng, 2014). Crucially though, even when a saccade was first made towards the distractor, there was still a performance benefit on salient trials. Even when proactive inhibition failed, young participants were able to reactively rapidly reject the distractor in a beneficial manner. Therefore, the presence of a performance benefit (i.e. better performance on salient trials) in this task must be attributed to both a failure of proactive (inhibition) and the engagement of reactive (rapid rejection) processes.

The fMRI analysis in DiQuattro and Geng (2011) provided converging evidence for the notion that this task engages reactive distractor suppression. It revealed that the left TPJ and left inferior frontal gyrus (IFG) were significantly more active when there was a high salience non-target compared to a low salience non-target. Dynamic causal modelling revealed a network in which left TPJ projects to left IFG that, in turn projects to the frontal eye fields (FEF). The authors interpreted this to mean that the ventral attention network (TPJ and IFG in this study) that is typically associated with bottom up attention (Corbetta and Shulman, 2002), updates control signals to the dorsal attentional network (FEF in this study). They refer to this network as an attentional circuit breaker that can reorient attention when top-down (i.e. proactive) attentional processes don't work or lead to counterproductive outcomes. Importantly, they further suggest that the TPJ and IFG are effectively generating a "reactive" control signal as a consequence of the stimulus presentation

(Braver et al, 2009; Braver, 2012). Additional converging evidence comes from studies of young adults with high expression of psychosis proneness, who have been shown to favor reactive distractor suppression relative to proactive distractor suppression (Abu-Akel et al, 2016a; 2016b; 2016c). In the t-task described above, performance benefits from the presence of the salient distractor scale with the expression of psychosis proneness (Abu-Akel et al., 2018), highlighting that this paradigm is sensitive enough to detect variations in the magnitude of engagement of reactive distractor suppression.

Moreover, another advantage of this task is that it avoids engaging general non-perceptual inhibition processes. The stimuli within the distractor is never a valid response option (a sideways t shape instead of upright or inverted), so participants won't be primed to make a specific response if they do process the distractor, which would then need to be inhibited. In addition (unlike stop-signal tasks), the "correct" response never changes within the course of a trial so they never have to switch responses. Indeed, older participants appear to be impaired in a stop-signal task (Kramer et al, 1994), which tests participants' ability to cancel a motor response while it is already being executed (and therefore presumably measures reactive inhibition). However, the requirement to cancel an already executable motor response may relate to other processes (primarily motor cancelation/response inhibition) which may be independent or more complex than reactive inhibition per se. (Swick, Ashley, and Turken, 2011; Kolodny, Mevorach, and Shalev, 2017). In fact, Anguerra and Gazzaley (2012) have highlighted the independence of impairments in response inhibition and perceptual inhibition (but not exclusively reactive inhibition) in old age. In our study, by design, only differences in perceptual inhibition are likely to change behavior.

This paradigm is distinct from the proportion congruence studies in two important ways. First, proportion congruence effects rely on the implicit learning of the associations between different items and their likelihood of conflict (Blais et al, 2012). It is possible that proportion congruence effects may be less susceptible to age-related decline due to their reliance on implicit learning (Cohen-Shikora, Diede, & Bugg, 2018). However, in our task, there is an even probability of

all trial types and making a correct response does not depend on any element of previous trials. Thus, our task may tap into a more temporally bounded form of reactive control. Second, our paradigm manipulated stimulus presentation duration to assess the timing of reactive control. As far as we know, no previous studies have done this.

In the present study we compared old and young participants' performance on the T-search task to directly assess if reactive inhibition is impaired or intact in old age. If in older participants reactive distractor inhibition is indeed intact (irrespective of a possible proactive impairment), it is expected they will derive a benefit from the presence of the salient distractor compared to a similar distractor. Conversely, if older participants have impaired reactive distractor suppression, it is expected that they show minimal benefit from the presence of a salient distractor.

## Experiment 1a

### Methods

#### *IRB Approval*

All experiments in this study were approved by the Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics Ethical Review Committee at the University of Birmingham.

#### *Participants*

25 young participants and 26 older participants participated in two successive behavioral experiments. Three subjects (2 older, 1 younger) were excluded from the analysis due to poor performance (Overall accuracy across conditions < 60%; A cut-off of 60% was chosen to balance between exclude participants who were guessing or did not understand the task, and including participants who simply had low accuracy), resulting in 24 young participants (Mean Age: 18.8, SEM of Age: .19, Age Range: 18 -21; 23 Females) and 24 older participants' (Mean Age: 70.1, SEM of Age: 1.63, Age Range: 60 - 82; 13 Females) data being analysed. All participants had normal or corrected to normal vision. The order of the tasks was counterbalanced to account for possible fatigue and

order effects. The other experiment is reported elsewhere and has no relevance to the current investigation. Young participants were recruited from the undergraduate population in the school of psychology at the University of Birmingham, UK. They were compensated for their participation with course credits. The older participants were recruited from a volunteer pool maintained by the School of Psychology at the University of Birmingham. They were compensated for 1.5 hours of their time with a one-time payment of £7. All participants had to sign an informed consent form prior to the study. Participants' were healthy with no history of head injury, mental health issues or neurological disorders. The old participants were screened for decline in cognitive functions using the Montreal Cognitive Assessment (MoCA). All of the older participants scored within the normal range (Mean Score: 27.5, SEM of Score: .23).

#### *Power Analysis*

An a priori statistical power analysis was performed for sample size estimation, based on data from DiQuattro and Geng (2011; N = 21). They found that the presence of a salient distractor significantly improved both response time and accuracy for healthy young participants, with an effect size of  $d = 2.9$  and  $d = 1.7$ , respectively. These are considered to be extremely large using Cohen's (1988) criteria. With an  $\alpha = .05$  and power = 0.95, the projected sample size needed to detect an effect size of 1.7 (GPower 3.1.9.2; Faul et al, 2007; 2009) is approximately N = 6 for a repeated measures ANOVA with a within-between subjects interaction. However, one possibility is that the effect size will be much smaller for the older participants. Therefore, as an additional check the projected sample size needed to detect an effect size of .3 (with all the same other parameters) is approximately N = 40 (20 per group). Thus, our sample size of 51 should be adequate to assess the main objectives of this study, unless the effect size for older participants is lower than .3. This power analysis also applies to experiment 2 which has a sample size of 39.


### *Stimuli and Procedure*

Participants were presented with five blocks of 46 trials each. Color was defined using RGB color coordinates. The background color of the display was grey [100 100 100]. On all trials, target and non-target stimuli were displayed. Each stimulus was a square whose center was 6.5 degrees of visual angle (horizontally 6.3 degrees; vertically 1 degree; all measures of visual angle were calculated assuming a viewing distance of 50 cm) diagonally left or right and below the center of the screen. Each square subtended 1.8 degrees of visual angle. The target square was dark grey [120 120 120]. In the target square, a vertical line with a width of .224 degrees of visual angle bisected the square. A second horizontal line also appeared to create a 'T'-like shape (Figure 1). These lines were a dark grey [80 80 80]. On half of trials, the horizontal line was .281 degrees of visual angle above the center of the square, creating an 'Upright' T (Figure 1) and on the other half, the horizontal line was .281 degrees of visual angle below the center of the square creating an 'Inverted' T. The color of the non-target square depended on the trial type. On 'Similar' trials, the color was the same as the target square. On 'Salient' trials, the non-target square was white [255 255 255]. In the non-target square, an horizontal line with a height of .224 degrees of visual angle bisected the square. A second vertical line also appeared to create a sideways 'T'-like shape (Figure 1). On 'Similar' trials, the line color was the same as inside the target square. On 'Salient' trials, the line color was black [0 0 0]. On 50% of trials, the vertical line was .281 degrees of visual angle right of the center of the square, creating a clockwise rotated "T". On 50% of the trials, the vertical line was .281 degrees of visual angle left of the center of the square creating a counter-clockwise rotated "T".

In each block there were 50% "Salient" trials and 50% "Similar" trials, randomly intermixed. On any given trial there was a 50% chance that the target would appear in the left position and 50% chance that it would appear in the right position. Participants had to identify if there was an upright or inverted "T" stimulus on each trial by pressing the "H" or "B" keys, respectively. These buttons were chosen because the "H" key is positioned above the "B" key on the keyboard, mimicking the spatial orientation of the target stimuli, where the upright "T" stimulus has a horizontal line above

255 the center of the stimulus square and the inverted “T” stimulus has a horizontal line below the  
256 center of the stimulus square.

257 Every trial began with a white [255 255 255] fixation cross presented at the center of the  
258 screen, which persisted throughout the trial (including during ‘blank’ screens). Each trial began with  
259 blank screen. The “fixation” time was randomly selected based on a uniform distribution of times  
260 between 1500 – 2000 msec (Figure 1). Next, the appropriate stimulus (depending on the trial) was  
261 displayed for 200 msec. Participants could respond starting when the stimulus was presented. After  
262 the stimulus was removed, the participant was presented with blank screen until they made a  
263 response. Once a response was made, the next trial would begin. Participants were given the  
264 chance to take short breaks in between blocks (< 5 min). Each session began with 20 practice trials.  
265 During the practice, participants received visual feedback such that if they made an identification  
266 error, the fixation cross changed to red for 250 msec before turning back to white for the rest of the  
267 fixation time.



268

269 Figure 1. Diagram of the reactive distractor inhibition task. Participants were presented with either a salient or similar stimulus on any give trial. In the  
 270 salient example the correct response would be to press the H-key to indicate an upright target. In the similar example the correct response would be to  
 271 press the B-key to indicate an inverted target.

## Results & Discussion

Response time in msec (RT) and accuracy rate (i.e. proportion of correct responses) were measured as dependent variables. All values are presented as mean +/- standard error of the mean. The data was cleaned to account for outliers. For each participant, response time data that was greater than and less than 2 standard deviations from the participants' individual mean was excluded from all analyses. The individual mean response time was calculated separately for each salience condition (salient trials and similar trials). This resulted in the loss of an average of 4.37% (SEM = .22%) of the response time data per older participant and 3.71% (SEM = .23%) per young participant. An independent samples t-test revealed that these values were significantly different ( $t(46) = -2.039$ ,  $p = .047$ ,  $d = .58$ ). This is attributable to the notion that older participants tend to exhibit greater variability in cognitive performance (Hultsch and MacDonald, Chapter 4 in Dixon et al, 2004; Morse, 1993) than younger participants. As such, their response time distributions would be wider and they would have more trials that would fall outside of 2 standard deviations from the mean.

For the accuracy data, a rationalized arcsine transformation (Equation 1) was applied to each participants' overall accuracy in each salience condition. This was done to account for possible violations of normality that can arise in binomially distributed data. The rationalized arcsine transformation was designed to normalize the data in accordance with the arcsine transformation while maintaining a more intuitive scale for interpretation of results (Studebaker, 1985). Since the transformation don't reflect true probabilities, they will not be reported with a % symbol, but for interpretation purposes the values do approximate the raw data, albeit skewed towards larger values than the raw data.

$$RArcSine = \left( 46.47324337 * \left( 2 * \arcsin(\sqrt{Accuracy}) \right) \right) - 23$$

Equation 1. This rationalized arcsine transformation calculates the standard arcsine transformation, then adjusts the value such that a proportion of .5 will have a transform of 50, rather than 1.5708.



Transformed accuracy values (Figure 2a) were analysed using a repeated measures ANOVA with Saliency (salient distractor vs similar distractor) as within subject factor and participants age group (Young vs Older) as a between subject factor. The main effects of salience ( $F(1,46) = 2.368$ ,  $p = .131$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = .049$ ) and age group ( $F(1,46) = .446$ ,  $p = .508$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = .010$ ), were not significant, but there was a significant interaction between salience and age group ( $F(1,46) = 5.132$ ,  $p = .028$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = .100$ ). Planned comparisons with paired samples t-tests comparing performance in the salient and similar conditions within each age group revealed that for older participants there was no significant difference in accuracy for salient ( $90.99 \pm 2.88$ ) and similar trials ( $92.00 \pm 1.78$ ,  $t(23) = -.505$ ,  $p = .618$ ,  $d = .10$ ). In contrast, young participants were more accurate on salient trials ( $96.28 \pm 2.52$ ) than on similar trials ( $90.98 \pm 2.56$ ;  $t(23) = 2.739$ ,  $p = .012$ ;  $d = .56$ ).

Moreover, an independent samples t-test revealed there was no significant difference in RArcSine transformed accuracy during the similar condition between the young ( $90.98 \pm 2.56$ ) and older ( $92.00 \pm 1.78$ ), participants ( $t(46) = -.329$ ,  $p = .744$ ,  $d = .09$ ), which highlights that the group differences we observed were not due to greater difficulty in identifying the stimuli by the older group. It also confirms that the benefit effect for the young participants was specifically due to enhanced performance in the presence of a salient distractor.

For the Response Time data, the raw response times were transformed into z-scores to account for generalized speed of processing deficits reported in aging populations that can be confounded with inhibition deficits (Craig and Salthouse, 2011; Salthouse, 1994; 1996; 2000; Salthouse and Meinz, 1995). We applied a z-score transformation to each individual subject's response time data by subtracting their overall mean response time from their condition mean (Salient or Similar), then dividing by the standard deviation of their condition means. To be clear, this was done separately for their salient and similar condition data. This procedure has been used previously to account for speed of processing deficits (Tsvetanov et al, 2013) in aging populations and is described in more detail in Faust et al (1999).

The z-RT data were analysed using a repeated measures ANOVA with Saliency (salient distractor vs similar distractor) as within subject factor and participants age group (Young vs Older) as a between subject factor (Figure 2b). The analysis revealed a main effect of saliency ( $F(1,46) = 15.173, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .248$ ), where participants were quicker to respond to salient trials ( $z\text{-RT} = -.103 \pm .025$ ) than to similar trials ( $z\text{-RT} = .071 \pm .020$ ; Smaller values reflect faster response times). This effect is a typical result for this paradigm and supports the notion that participants are engaged in reactive cognitive control and utilise the salient distractor as an anti-cue (DiQuattro and Geng, 2011; Geng and DiQuattro, 2010). There was not a main effect of age group ( $F(1,46) = 2.629, p = .112, \eta_p^2 = .054$ ), but there was an interaction between salience and age group ( $F(1,46) = 7.881, p = .007, \eta_p^2 = .146$ ).

We conducted planned comparisons using a paired samples t-test to compare z-RTs for the two salience conditions in each group. For the older participants, there was no significant difference in z-RT across salience conditions ( $t(23) = -.782, p = .442, d = .16$ ; Salient:  $z\text{-RT} = -.033 \pm .034$ ; Similar:  $z\text{-RT} = .015 \pm .029$ ). However, younger participants responded significantly quicker ( $t(23) = -4.665, p < .001, d = .95$ ) in the salient condition ( $z\text{-RT} = -.17 \pm .038$ ) compared with the similar condition ( $z\text{-RT} = .127 \pm .027$ ). These results suggest that the main effect of saliency was primarily driven by the younger participants and that the older participants showed no benefit in performance when the salient distractor appeared.




Figure 2. (a) Graph reflecting mean of RArcSine transformed accuracy for salient and similar conditions across age groups. (b) Graph reflecting z-scored response time data (msec) for salient and similar conditions across age groups. PES stands for partial eta squared and d stands for cohen's d.

## Experiment 1b

The identical performance we documented for older participants in the similar and salient trials could potentially stem from reduced visual contrast sensitivity in this age group (Roberts and Allen, 2016; Pardhan, 2004; Owsley et al, 1983; Sekuler et al, 1980). One possible complication in any aging study of higher order cognitive abilities – such as reactive cognitive control – is that low quality information due to age-related impairments to lower level perceptual abilities may cascade through the information processing stream affecting performance (the information degradation hypothesis; Monge and Madden, 2016; but see Houston et al, 2016 for a counter-perspective). Notably, Porto et al (2016) found that controlling for visual acuity scaled and/or eliminated an age-related reduction in posterior P3b amplitude during a visual oddball task. The posterior P3b amplitude is generally presumed to be indicative of higher-level decision making and executive functions, although it should be noted that the specific role of the posterior P3b amplitude is still under a great deal of debate (See Polich, 2007 for a more in-depth discussion).

Indeed, if our older participants were not sensitive to the contrast differences between salient and similar non-targets then their performance in the two conditions would be equivalent. To exclude this possibility, we invited a subset of the older participants who took part in experiment 1a back and assessed whether or not they are able to distinguish between the two contrast conditions (Salient vs Similar). In experiment 1b we presented the exact same stimuli to a set of older participants, but instead of responding to the t-shapes, they had to indicate if the box colors of the two elements of the display (target and non-target) were the same or different. If the participants can successfully distinguish between the salient and non-salient stimuli, then we can be confident that age-related impairments to visual contrast sensitivity are not influencing our results.

## Methods

### *Participants*

5 older participants (Mean Age: 70.8, SEM of Age: 2.35, Age Range: 65 - 78; 1 Female) participated in the experiment. The older participants were recruited from the initial cohort who

participated in Experiment 1a. They were compensated for 1.5 hours of their time with a one-time payment of £7. All participants had to sign an informed consent form prior to the study. Participants' were healthy with no history of head injury, mental health issues or neurological disorders. The older participants were screened for decline in cognitive functions using the Montreal Cognitive Assessment (MoCA). All of the older participants scored within the normal range ( $\geq 26$  out of 30).

### *Stimuli and Procedure*

The stimuli and procedure were exactly the same as in experiment 1a except that instead of indicating if the target were upright or inverted, participants pressed the "h" key to indicate if the two stimulus boxes were the same color (similar trials) and the "b" key if they were different (salient trials).

## **Results and Discussion**

Overall raw accuracy across the 5 participants was very high (Mean = 98%  $\pm$  .68%). The data was transformed to a rationalized arcsine measure, consistent with experiment 1a. To assess the RArcSine transformed accuracy results, a one-way one-sample t-test was conducted to determine if a statistically significant difference existed between the average RArcSine and an RArcSine of 50 (equivalent to a proportion correct of .5). The t-test was significant,  $t(4) = 19.8$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $d = 8.85$ , suggesting that older participants were able to successfully distinguish between the salient and non-salient stimulus boxes.

The response time was not z-transformed like in experiment 1a since there is only an older participants group and we do not need to account for group differences. However, the response time data was cleaned to account for outliers using the same procedure described in experiment 1a. This resulted in the loss of an average of 4.69% (SEM = .59%) of the response time data for salient trials and 3.82% (SEM = .89%) of the response time data for similar trials. A paired samples t-test revealed that these were not significantly different ( $t(4) = 1.12$ ,  $p = .326$ ,  $d = .5$ ). The ability to distinguish successfully between these scenarios was evidenced by virtually identical response times

for same (Mean = 592 +/- 37.4 msec) and different (593 +/- 37.5 msec) trials ( $t(4) = -.029$ ,  $p = .977$ ,  $d = .013$ ), confirming that older participants were not simply increasing accuracy during different trials by taking more time.

Overall, these results exclude the possibility that the lack of benefit for older participants, observed in Experiment 1a was attributed to impairments to visual contrast sensitivity yielding the salient and similar trials identical for our older participants. It should be noted that although there is a small sample size in this study, the consistently high accuracy ( $\geq 96\%$ ) across all participants and their age range allows us to be relatively confident that these results are a reasonable estimation of our participants' visual contrast sensitivity.

## Experiment 2

Although we show that general age-related processing speed deficits can't fully account for our data (as overall RTs were not associated with the benefit measure for older participants), it is still possible that certain aspects of processing speed affect older participants ability to utilise reactive distractor suppression this task. For instance, if older adults take longer to accumulate evidence that will yield a disengagement decision from a non-target element, it might be the case that even though they are sensitive to the contrast differences it takes them similar amount of time to reach a decision to disengage. In experiment 1b, it took the older participants 592 msec to simply discriminate between the salient and similar conditions, whereas in experiment 1a they were only given 200 msec to use the salient distractor. Thus, it is possible that in old age effective reactive distractor suppression is possible given enough time.

This idea would fit with the argument that older participants favor reactive control in the first place because it takes longer to accumulate neural resources in old age and reactive control typically requires fewer resources over a shorter period of time compared to proactive control (Grady, 2012). Consequently, slow resource accumulation could theoretically impact reactive control as well. In particular, it would result in a delayed initiation of reactive inhibition. If the initiation of

reactive distractor suppression is delayed in older cohorts, then we would expect them to be able to effectively utilise reactive distractor suppression as long as they are given enough time to engage reactive suppression mechanisms.

To address the possibility that there is an age-related delay in the initiation of reactive inhibition processes, Experiment 2 was conducted in which the stimulus presentation time was extended from 200 msec to 600 msec. If the initiation of reactive inhibition takes longer in old age, then a longer presentation time should allow older participants to take advantage of the salient distractor, and we would expect to see a performance benefit. Alternatively, if reactive inhibition is simply less effective in old age we expect to replicate the results from experiment 1a and find no performance benefit for the old participants.

## Methods

### *Participants*

20 young participants (Mean Age: 19.2, SEM of Age: .20, Age Range: 18 -21; 18 Females) and 19 older participants (Mean Age: 69.47, SEM of Age: 1.12, Age Range: 62 - 78; 11 Females) participated in the experiment. Like experiment 1a, we planned to exclude any participants with less than 60% overall accuracy, but no participants met this criterion and none were excluded from analysis. Young participants were recruited from the undergraduate population in the school of psychology at the University of Birmingham, UK. They were compensated for their participation with course credits. The older participants were recruited from a volunteer pool maintained by the School of Psychology at the University of Birmingham. They were compensated for 1.5 hours of their time with a one-time payment of £7. All participants had to sign an informed consent form prior to the study. Participants' were healthy with no history of head injury, mental health issues or neurological disorders. The older participants were screened for decline in cognitive functions using the Montreal Cognitive Assessment (MoCA). All of the older participants scored within the normal range ( $\geq 26$  out of 30).

#### 445 *Stimuli and Procedure*

446 The stimuli and procedure were exactly the same as in experiment 1a, except that the  
447 stimulus was presented for 600 msec instead of 200 msec.

### 448 **Results and Discussion**

449 Response time in msec (RT) and accuracy rate (i.e. proportion of correct responses) were  
450 measured as dependent variables. The response time data was cleaned to account for outliers. For  
451 each participant, response time data that was greater than and less than 2 standard deviations from  
452 the mean was excluded from all analyses. The mean response time was calculated separately for  
453 each salience condition (salient trials and similar trials). This resulted in the loss of an average of  
454 3.64% (SEM = .22%) of the response time data, per older participant and 3.61% (SEM = .24%) per  
455 young participant. An independent samples t-test revealed that these values were not significantly  
456 different ( $t(37) = -.093$ ,  $p = .927$ ). All values are presented as mean  $\pm$  standard error of the mean.


457 Accuracy data was rationalized arcsine (RArcSine) transformed and response time data was  
458 z-transformed using the same procedures as in experiment 1a. RArcSine transformed accuracy and z-  
459 transformed response time were analysed using a repeated measures ANOVA with Saliency (salient  
460 distractor vs similar distractor) as within subject factor and participants age group (Young vs Older)  
461 as a between subject factor. Data is reported as mean  $\pm$  standard error of the mean.

462 For RArcSine transformed accuracy (Figure 3a), the main effect of salience was significant  
463 ( $F(1,37) = 39.75$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = 0.518$ ), driven by more accurate responses during salient trials  
464 ( $109.99 \pm 1.68$ ) relative to similar trials ( $102.07 \pm 1.56$ ). However, the main effect of age group  
465 ( $F(1,37) = .05$ ,  $p = .824$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = 0.001$ ) and the interaction ( $F(1,37) = 1.3$ ,  $p = .261$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = 0.034$ ) were not  
466 significant. This data suggests that, in terms of RArcSine transformed accuracy, the young and older  
467 participants were equally effective at using the salient distractor as an anti-cue when the stimulus  
468 presentation time was extended.



For response time (Figure 3b), the main effect of salience was significant ( $F(1,37) = 84.654$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = 0.696$ ) driven by relatively faster responses during salient trials ( $zRT: -.451 \pm .053$ ) compared to similar trials ( $zRT: .271 \pm .026$ ), suggesting that the salient distractor provided a benefit to performance. However, the main effect of age group ( $F(1,37) = 1.211$ ,  $p = .278$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = 0.032$ ), and the interaction were not significant ( $F(1,37) = 3.696$ ,  $p = .062$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = 0.091$ ). Given the marginal p-value for the interaction, we conducted an exploratory analysis to assess whether there is potential evidence the interaction is driven by a lack of performance benefit (i.e. the difference between salient and similar performance) for the older adults. Crucially, simple effects revealed that the difference in performance between the salient and similar conditions was significant for both the young ( $p < .001$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = 0.632$ ; Salient:  $-.542$ ; Similar:  $.330$ ) and older ( $p < .001$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = 0.411$ ; Salient:  $-.359$ ; Similar:  $.212$ ) cohorts. Further simple effects revealed that there was no difference in performance between older and younger participants for the salient trials ( $p = .093$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = 0.075$ ; Older:  $-.359$ ; Younger:  $-.542$ ), but there was a difference in performance for the similar trials ( $p = .031$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = 0.120$ ; Older:  $.212$ ; Younger:  $.330$ ; Older participants were less slowed during similar trials). This verifies that despite the trending interaction, both age groups showed a clear performance benefit in the presence of a salient distractor, even if it is attenuated in the older cohort.

These data suggest that given enough time older participants are able to use the salient distractor as an anti-cue as effectively as the younger participants. This suggests that older participants may take longer to initiate reactive inhibition, possibly due to the slower accumulation of neural resources, but that given enough time reactive inhibition can be effectively implemented.



490

491 Figure 3. (a) Graph reflecting mean RArcSine transformed accuracy for salient and similar conditions  
 492 across age groups. (b) Graph reflecting z-scored response time data (msec) for salient and similar  
 493 conditions across age groups.

## General Discussion

The purpose of this study was to assess the effect of aging on reactive suppression in older populations by comparing performance in a task that relies on reactive suppression in young participants too. In experiment 1a, with a 200 msec display, we found that young participants were able to effectively use a salient distractor as an anti-cue to benefit performance in terms of both accuracy and response time, demonstrating effective reactive distractor suppression. Older participants on the other hand showed no change in performance when the salient distractor was present in the display. Importantly, the lack of performance benefit for old participants could not be attributed to reduced contrast sensitivity as a subset of the older participants were shown to be able to distinguish between low and high contrast items in experiment 1b. However, experiment 2 showed that older participants could engage reactive inhibition if given enough time. When the stimulus presentation time was extended to 600 msec, older participants showed better performance during salient trials than similar trials (in both accuracy and response time) at an equivalent magnitude to the young participants. These data suggest that older participants have a delayed initiation of reactive inhibition processes that scales with age, but that given enough time effective reactive inhibition is possible. Prior literature typically shows a) impairments to proactive control in aging and b) a shift from proactive to reactive mechanisms in aging. Despite the dearth of studies directly investigating reactive control deficits, this has led to an implicit (and sometimes explicit) assumption throughout prior literature that older participants shift to reactive control because proactive control is impaired and reactive control is intact. Our study challenges this notion as we did find an age-related deficit in a measure reflecting reactive distractor inhibition. That being said, it is possible that reactive control is less impaired than proactive control, which induces a shift, but that is a different issue than shifting due to no deficit.

One concern for this type of research in general is that inhibition deficits may in fact be attributed to a generalized deficit in processing speed (Salthouse and Meintz, 1995; Salthouse, 2000; Verhaeghen and De Meersman; 1998). Since most studies that identify inhibition deficits measure

response time, it could appear as if there were impaired response times in a specific inhibition task for older participants, when in fact they are simply overall slower. However, even after accounting for this possibility, inhibition deficits still persist in many inhibition tasks (Verhaeghen and Cerella, 2002). In our study, we z-transformed the response time data to account for this possibility and still found no performance benefit in the 200 msec condition (Experiment 1a). As such, we would argue that the age-related lack of a benefit we report cannot be attributed to general speed of processing deficits and is more likely associated with a delay in reactive distractor suppression specifically.

A second concern with respect to this specific study is that the deficit observed may in fact be completely or partially due to age-related impairments in attentional orienting rather than reactive inhibition. The nature of orienting attention is complex and there are many variables to consider, particularly with respect to aging (see Erel and Levy, 2016 for a comprehensive review), but the most relevant aspects in the context of our study are covert and overt orienting, and exogenous and endogenous orienting. Participants in the current study were instructed to keep their eyes focused on the fixation point throughout the trials ostensibly to encourage covert attention (no eye movements) which is also likely given the short presentation times in experiment 1a, however eye tracking was not employed so the use of overt attention cannot be ruled out. Regardless, research shows that older participants typically do not have impairments in covert attentional orienting (Jennings et al, 2007), and that while deficits in overt attention tasks have been reported (Kingstone et al, 2002), it has been argued that they can be attributed to deficits in motor control over eye movements (Chen and Machado, 2016; Dowiasch et al, 2015; Warren et al, 2013; Crawford et al, 2013; Klein et al, 2000, Ross et al, 1999) rather than attentional control (Erel and Levy, 2016).

With regard to exogenous and endogenous orienting during trials with a salient distractor, it is arguable that this study engages both. Geng and DiQuattro (2010) showed that salient distractors could facilitate performance (using a similar t-task paradigm to our study) using a combination of two attentional strategies: inhibition, where saccades toward the salient distractor are actively

inhibited, and rapid rejection, where a saccade toward the salient distractor is quickly disengaged and redirected towards the target. Inhibition took place on target-first trials, when the first saccade went towards the target, and rapid rejection followed by inhibition took place on distractor-first trials, when the first saccade went towards the salient distractor. Within the task, the process of rapid rejection essentially consists of three phases: Orienting attention towards the salient distractor, disengaging attention from the salient distractor, and reorienting attention towards the target/inhibiting the salient distractor. The initial orienting of eye movements towards the salient distractor is a classic example of overt exogenous orienting. However, disengaging, reorienting, and inhibiting only begins because the participants recognize the distractor as such, making the target no longer in an unpredictable location. This suggests that endogenous orienting is an integral part of reactive distractor suppression processes which are likely important for performance in our task.

Previous studies have typically reported intact (Waszak et al, 2010; Iarocci et al, 2009; Jennings et al, 2007; Folk and Hoyer, 1992; Craik and Byrd, 1982) or even enhanced (Langley et al, 2011a; 2011b; Mahoney et al, 2010) exogenous orienting in aging. In contrast, endogenous attention is sometimes reported to be impaired (Olk and Kingstone, 2009; Bojko et al, 2004; Brodeur and Enns, 1997; Greenwood et al, 1993; see also Erel and Levy, 2016). Furthermore, impaired (i.e. slow) attentional disengagement (Owsley, 2016; Greenwood and Parasuraman, 1994) has also been documented in older populations. Consequently, if spatial endogenous disengagement and orienting is impaired in old age it may well be the case that these impairments also manifest in impaired reactive distractor suppression.

Nevertheless, disengagement and endogenous orienting are likely engaged in both salient and similar trials in our task as both trials may involve the initial selection of the non-target item (Geng & DiQuattro, 2010). Thus, an impairment in these processes should have affected performance in both trial types. However, the older participants in Experiment 1a did not show such a general impaired performance. In fact, accuracy was the same for both young (86%) and older

(86.2%) participants during the similar condition in experiment 1a. As such, the performance patterns we report point to a difference in the efficiency of processes that are specifically utilised when a salient distractor is present. One reason behind this could simply be a slower processing capacity for salient items in old age (that is overcome when the input is presented for longer). This seems unlikely as Experiment 1b demonstrated that the older participants showed virtually no difference in response time when discriminating between similar (two low contrast stimuli) and salient (one low and one high contrast stimuli) conditions. If salient stimuli required more processing time in old age, we would have expected to see longer response times on trials where a salient item was present in the display. A second, and seemingly more likely explanation, is that old participants are exhibiting impairments in the reactive suppression of salient information (rather than having difficulty processing salient information in the first place). In fact, impaired suppression of salient information in old age has previously been reported by Tsvetanov et al (2013) in the context of a proactive inhibition task. It is therefore possible that older adults exhibit impairments in salience suppression in general, regardless of whether reactive or proactive inhibition is called upon.

A final possibility is that 600 msec is too long to still be considered “reactive.” According to Irlbacher et al (2014), reactive control can be parsed into an early and late mechanism and that each mechanism provides a unique method of identifying and resolving conflict. In the context of working memory inhibition, both mechanisms resolve interference that occurs when a familiar stimulus is identified but must be ignored. Familiarity-inhibition models favor speed over accuracy and are considered to be a quick and early acting reactive control mechanism, engaging around 300-450 ms after stimulus presentation (Du et al, 2008). In these models, the interference is resolved through the inhibition of the familiar stimulus (Mecklinger et al, 2003). On the other hand, context retrieval models favor accuracy over speed and are considered to be a slower and late acting reactive control mechanism, engaging around 550 ms after stimulus presentation (Zhang et al, 2010). In these models, the interference is resolved by selecting for the relevant target features more strongly (by retrieving the appropriate contextual information; Badre and Wagner, 2005; 2007). Based on this, it

is reasonable to believe that reactive processes were used by participants with a presentation time of 600 msec.

However, despite indications that our data reflect an impairment in reactive distractor suppression, a major limitation was that we did not use eye-tracking and therefore cannot tease apart the relative contribution of proactive and reactive distractor suppression during this task. In other words, there is no direct evidence that young and old participants are completing the task in a similar manner (i.e. specifically via reactive control mechanisms). That being said, Geng and DiQuattro (2010) showed that young participants had a failure of proactive control mechanisms (i.e. a saccade was made to the salient distractor) on ~68% of trials, leading necessarily to the engagement of reactive control mechanisms (i.e. rapid rejection). Importantly, performance on these “reactive” trials was still better than on control trials on which the first saccade went to a non-salient distractor, suggesting that the reactive rejection of the salient distractor was facilitated even when it initially captured attention. Based on this we can infer that a similar proportion of “proactive failure” trials likely occurred in our study for the young participants. Further, in conjunction with well-characterized prior literature that has shown age-related deficit across proactive control mechanisms, we also infer that “proactive failures” are probably more common in our older cohort. This would suggest that our older cohort likely relied more on reactive control mechanisms to complete the task than the younger cohort. However, this is ultimately speculative and must be confirmed in future research with other methods.

Overall, this study suggests that older participants exhibit an age-related delay in the initiation of reactive inhibition. The nature of this impairment is hypothesized to be specific to reactive salience suppression, since the underlying rapid rejection and inhibition processes appear intact when there is no salient distractor present (as evidenced by equivalent performance across age groups in experiment 1a during similar trials). Future research will have to investigate the underlying impairment that leads to this delay in the initiation of reactive distractor suppression. For

example, reactive distractor suppression may be engaged late because of the slower accumulation of neural resources (Grady, 2012), or because the attentional capture process is intact but the delay is in the transition to inhibition/rapid rejection, or because both attentional capture and inhibition/rapid rejection are independently delayed. Of course, these possibilities are not necessarily mutually exclusive. An alternative explanation that could account for this data is that there is a “fast” and a “slow” reactive control mechanism and that only the faster reactive mechanism is impaired. Future research will have to distinguish between these possibilities.



## References

- 642
- 643 Abu-Akel, A., Apperly, I. A., Wood, S. J., Hansen, P. C., & Mevorach, C. (2016). Autism
- 644 Tendencies and Psychosis Proneness Interactively Modulate Saliency Cost.
- 645 *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, sbw066. <https://doi.org/10.1093/schbul/sbw066>
- 646 Abu-Akel, A., Apperly, I., Spaniol, M., Geng, J., & Mevorach, C. (2016). Context-given
- 647 benefits: Saliency-based selection as a function of autism and psychosis traits. *Journal*
- 648 *of Vision*, 16(12), 16. <https://doi.org/10.1167/16.12.16>
- 649 Abu-Akel, A., Apperly, I., Spaniol, M. M., Geng, J. J., & Mevorach, C. (2018). Diametric
- 650 effects of autism tendencies and psychosis proneness on attention control irrespective
- 651 of task demands. *Scientific Reports*, 8(1), 8478. [https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-26821-7)
- 652 [26821-7](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-26821-7)
- 653 Abu-Akel, A. M., Apperly, I. A., Wood, S. J., & Hansen, P. C. (2016). Autism and psychosis
- 654 expressions diametrically modulate the right temporoparietal junction. *Social*
- 655 *Neuroscience*, 0(0), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17470919.2016.1190786>
- 656 Amer, T., Campbell, K. L., & Hasher, L. (2016). Cognitive Control As a Double-Edged
- 657 Sword. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 20(12), 905–915.
- 658 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2016.10.002>
- 659 Andrews-Hanna, J. R., Snyder, A. Z., Vincent, J. L., Lustig, C., Head, D., Raichle, M. E., &
- 660 Buckner, R. L. (2007). Disruption of Large-Scale Brain Systems in Advanced Aging.
- 661 *Neuron*, 56(5), 924–935. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2007.10.038>
- 662 Anguera, J. A., & Gazzaley, A. (2012). Dissociation of motor and sensory inhibition
- 663 processes in normal aging. *Clinical Neurophysiology*, 123(4), 730–740.
- 664 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2011.08.024>
- 665 Aschenbrenner, A. J., & Balota, D. A. (2017). Dynamic adjustments of attentional control in
- 666 healthy aging. *Psychology and Aging*, 32(1), 1. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pag0000148>

- 667 Ashinoff, B. K. (2017). *The behavioral and neural correlates of cognitive control across the*  
 668 *lifespan* (PhD). University of Birmingham. <http://etheses.bham.ac.uk/7738/>
- 669 Badre, D., & Wagner, A. D. (2005). Frontal lobe mechanisms that resolve proactive  
 670 interference. *Cerebral Cortex*, 15(12), 2003–2012.  
 671 <https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhi075>
- 672 Badre, David, & Wagner, A. D. (2007). Left ventrolateral prefrontal cortex and the cognitive  
 673 control of memory. *Neuropsychologia*, 45(13), 2883–2901.  
 674 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2007.06.015>
- 675 Bauer, E., Gebhardt, H., Gruppe, H., Gallhofer, B., & Sammer, G. (2012). Altered negative  
 676 priming in older subjects: first evidence from behavioral and neural level. *Frontiers in*  
 677 *Human Neuroscience*, 6, 270. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2012.00270>
- 678 Blais, C., & Bunge, S. (2009). Behavioral and Neural Evidence for Item-specific  
 679 Performance Monitoring. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 22(12), 2758–2767.  
 680 <https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn.2009.21365>
- 681 Blais, C., Harris, M. B., Guerrero, J. V., & Bunge, S. A. (2012). Rethinking the role of  
 682 automaticity in cognitive control. *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*,  
 683 65(2), 268–276. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17470211003775234>
- 684 Bloemendaal, M., Zandbelt, B., Wegman, J., van de Rest, O., Cools, R., & Aarts, E. (2016).  
 685 Contrasting neural effects of aging on proactive and reactive response inhibition.  
 686 *Neurobiology of Aging*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neurobiolaging.2016.06.007>
- 687 Bojko, A., Kramer, A. F., & Peterson, M. S. (2004). Age equivalence in switch costs for  
 688 prosaccade and antisaccade tasks. *Psychology and Aging*, 19(1), 226–234.  
 689 <https://doi.org/10.1037/0882-7974.19.1.226>
- 690 Braver, T. S. (2012). The variable nature of cognitive control: a dual mechanisms framework.  
 691 *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 16(2), 106–113.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2011.12.010>

Braver, T. S., & Barch, D. M. (2002). A theory of cognitive control, aging cognition, and neuromodulation. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, 26(7), 809–817.

[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0149-7634\(02\)00067-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0149-7634(02)00067-2)

Braver, T. S., Paxton, J. L., Locke, H. S., & Barch, D. M. (2009). Flexible neural mechanisms of cognitive control within human prefrontal cortex. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 106(18), 7351–7356. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0808187106>

Braver, T. S., Satpute, A. B., Rush, B. K., Racine, C. A., & Barch, D. M. (2005). Context Processing and Context Maintenance in Healthy Aging and Early Stage Dementia of the Alzheimer's Type. *Psychology and Aging*, 20(1), 33–46.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/0882-7974.20.1.33>

Brodeur, D. A., & Enns, J. T. (1997). Covert visual orienting across the lifespan. *Canadian Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 51(1), 20–35.

Bugg, J. M., Jacoby, L. L., & Toth, J. P. (2008). Multiple levels of control in the Stroop task. *Memory & Cognition*, 36(8), 1484–1494. <https://doi.org/10.3758/MC.36.8.1484>

Bugg, J. M. (2014a). Conflict-Triggered Top-Down Control: Default Mode, Last Resort, or No Such Thing? *Journal of Experimental Psychology. Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 40(2), 567–587. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0035032>

Bugg, J. M. (2014b). Evidence for the sparing of reactive cognitive control with age. *Psychology and Aging*, 29(1), 115–127. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0035270>

Bugg, J. M. (2015). The relative attractiveness of distractors and targets affects the coming and going of item-specific control: Evidence from flanker tasks. *Attention, Perception, & Psychophysics*, 77(2), 373–389. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13414-014-0752-x>

Bugg, J. M., & Chanani, S. (2011). List-wide control is not entirely elusive: Evidence from

717 picture–word Stroop. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 18(5), 930–936.

718 <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13423-011-0112-y>

719 Bugg, J. M., & Crump, M. J. C. (2012). In Support of a Distinction between Voluntary and  
720 Stimulus-Driven Control: A Review of the Literature on Proportion Congruent  
721 Effects. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 3. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2012.00367>

722 Bugg, J. M., Jacoby, L. L., & Chanani, S. (2011). Why it is too early to lose control in  
723 accounts of item-specific proportion congruency effects. *Journal of Experimental*  
724 *Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 37(3), 844–859.

725 Bush, G., Whalen, P. J., Rosen, B. R., Jenike, M. A., McInerney, S. C., & Rauch, S. L.  
726 (1998). The counting stroop: An interference task specialized for functional  
727 neuroimaging—validation study with functional MRI. *Human Brain Mapping*, 6(4),  
728 270–282. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1097-0193\(1998\)6:4<270::AID-](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-0193(1998)6:4<270::AID-HBM6>3.0.CO;2-0)  
729 [HBM6>3.0.CO;2-0](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-0193(1998)6:4<270::AID-HBM6>3.0.CO;2-0)

730 Chen, P. L., & Machado, L. (2016). Age-related deficits in voluntary control over saccadic  
731 eye movements: consideration of electrical brain stimulation as a therapeutic strategy.  
732 *Neurobiology of Aging*, 41, 53–63.  
733 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neurobiolaging.2016.02.010>

734 Cohen-Shikora, E. R., Diede, N. T., & Bugg, J. M. (2018). The flexibility of cognitive  
735 control: Age equivalence with experience guiding the way. *Psychology and Aging*,  
736 33(6), 924–939. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pag0000280>

737 Corbetta, M., & Shulman, G. L. (2002). Control of goal-directed and stimulus-driven  
738 attention in the brain. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 3(3), 201–215.  
739 <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn755>

740 Craik, F. I., & Byrd, M. (1982). Aging and cognitive deficits. Aging and cognitive processes.  
741 *Springer*, 191–211.

- 742 Craik, F. I. M., & Salthouse, T. A. (2011). *The Handbook of Aging and Cognition: Third*  
 743 *Edition*. Psychology Press.
- 744 Crawford, T. J., Higham, S., Mayes, J., Dale, M., Shaunak, S., & Lekwuwa, G. (2013). The  
 745 role of working memory and attentional disengagement on inhibitory control: effects  
 746 of aging and Alzheimer's disease. *AGE*, 35(5), 1637–1650.  
 747 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11357-012-9466-y>
- 748 Darowski, E. S., Helder, E., Zacks, R. T., Hasher, L., & Hambrick, D. Z. (2008). Age-related  
 749 differences in cognition: The role of distraction control. *Neuropsychology*, 22(5),  
 750 638–644. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0894-4105.22.5.638>
- 751 DiQuattro, N. E., & Geng, J. J. (2011). Contextual Knowledge Configures Attentional  
 752 Control Networks. *The Journal of Neuroscience*, 31(49), 18026–18035.  
 753 <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.4040-11.2011>
- 754 Dixon, R. A., Bäckman, L., Park, D. C., Backman, P. of P. at U. of G. D. of P. S. D. of N. and  
 755 G. M. L., & Nilsson, L.-G. (2004). *New Frontiers in Cognitive Aging*. Oxford  
 756 University Press.
- 757 Dowiasch, S., Marx, S., Einhäuser, W., & Bremmer, F. (2015). Effects of aging on eye  
 758 movements in the real world. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 9.  
 759 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2015.00046>
- 760 Du, Y., Xiao, Z., Song, Y., Fan, S., Wu, R., & Zhang, J. X. (2008). An electrophysiological  
 761 signature for proactive interference resolution in working memory. *International*  
 762 *Journal of Psychophysiology*, 69(2), 107–111.  
 763 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpsycho.2008.03.007>
- 764 Erel, H., & Levy, D. A. (2016). Orienting of visual attention in aging. *Neuroscience &*  
 765 *Biobehavioral Reviews*, 69, 357–380. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2016.08.010>
- 766 Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Buchner, A., & Lang, A.-G. (2009). Statistical power analyses using

- 767 G\*Power 3.1: Tests for correlation and regression analyses. *Behavior Research*  
 768 *Methods*, 41(4), 1149–1160. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BRM.41.4.1149>
- 769 Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A.-G., & Buchner, A. (2007). G\*Power 3: A flexible statistical  
 770 power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behavior*  
 771 *Research Methods*, 39(2), 175–191. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03193146>
- 772 Faust, M. E., Balota, D. A., Spieler, D. H., Ferraro, F. R., Faust, M. E., Psychology, D. O., ...  
 773 Department, P. (1999). Individual differences in information-processing rate and  
 774 amount: Implications for group differences in response latency. *Psychological*  
 775 *Bulletin*, 777–799.
- 776 Folk, C. L., & Hoyer, W. J. (1992). Aging and shifts of visual spatial attention. *Psychology*  
 777 *and Aging*, 7(3), 453–465. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0882-7974.7.3.453>
- 778 Frings, C., Schneider, K. K., & Fox, E. (2015). The negative priming paradigm: An update  
 779 and implications for selective attention. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 22(6),  
 780 1577–1597. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13423-015-0841-4>
- 781 Gazzaley, A., Cooney, J. W., Rissman, J., & D’Esposito, M. (2005). Top-down suppression  
 782 deficit underlies working memory impairment in normal aging. *Nature Neuroscience*,  
 783 8(10), 1298–1300. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nn1543>
- 784 Geerligs, L., Maurits, N. M., Renken, R. J., & Lorist, M. M. (2014). Reduced specificity of  
 785 functional connectivity in the aging brain during task performance. *Human Brain*  
 786 *Mapping*, 35(1), 319–330. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hbm.22175>
- 787 Geerligs, L., Saliassi, E., Maurits, N. M., Renken, R. J., & Lorist, M. M. (2014). Brain  
 788 mechanisms underlying the effects of aging on different aspects of selective attention.  
 789 *NeuroImage*, 91, 52–62. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2014.01.029>
- 790 Geng, J. J., & DiQuattro, N. E. (2010). Attentional capture by a perceptually salient non-  
 791 target facilitates target processing through inhibition and rapid rejection. *Journal of*

- 792           *Vision*, 10(6), 5–5. <https://doi.org/10.1167/10.6.5>
- 793   Glaser, W. R., & Glaser, M. O. (1989). Context effects in stroop-like word and picture  
794           processing. *Journal of Experimental Psychology. General*, 118(1), 13–42.
- 795   Gonthier, C., Braver, T. S., & Bugg, J. M. (2016). Dissociating proactive and reactive control  
796           in the Stroop task. *Memory & Cognition*, 44(5), 778–788.  
797           <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13421-016-0591-1>
- 798   Grady, C. (2012). The cognitive neuroscience of ageing. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*,  
799           13(7), 491–505. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn3256>
- 800   Greenwood, Pamela M., & Parasuraman, R. (1994). Attentional disengagement deficit in  
801           nondemented elderly over 75 years of age. *Aging, Neuropsychology, and Cognition*,  
802           1(3), 188–202. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13825589408256576>
- 803   Greenwood, P.M., Parasuraman, R., & Haxby, J. V. (1993). Changes in visuospatial attention  
804           over the adult lifespan. *Neuropsychologia*, 31(5), 471–485.  
805           [https://doi.org/10.1016/0028-3932\(93\)90061-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0028-3932(93)90061-4)
- 806   Hasher, L., Stoltzfus, E. R., Zacks, R. T., & Rypma, B. (1991). Age and inhibition. *Journal of*  
807           *Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 17(1), 163.
- 808   Hasher, L., & Zacks, R. T. (1988). Working Memory, Comprehension, and Aging: A Review  
809           and a New View. In G. H. Bower (Ed.), *Psychology of Learning and Motivation* (Vol.  
810           22, pp. 193–225). Academic Press. Retrieved from  
811           <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0079742108600419>
- 812   Houston, J. R., Bennett, I. J., Allen, P. A., & Madden, D. J. (2016). Visual Acuity does not  
813           Moderate Effect Sizes of Higher-Level Cognitive Tasks. *Experimental Aging*  
814           *Research*, 42(3), 221–263. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0361073X.2016.1156964>
- 815   Iarocci, G., Enns, J. T., Randolph, B., & Burack, J. A. (2009). The modulation of visual  
816           orienting reflexes across the lifespan. *Developmental Science*, 12(5), 715–724.

- 817 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7687.2009.00810.x>
- 818 Irlbacher, K., Kraft, A., Kehler, S., & Brandt, S. A. (2014). Mechanisms and neuronal  
819 networks involved in reactive and proactive cognitive control of interference in  
820 working memory. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, 46, Part 1, 58–70.  
821 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2014.06.014>
- 822 Jennings, J. M., Dagenbach, D., Engle, C. M., & Funke, L. J. (2007). Age-related changes  
823 and the attention network task: an examination of alerting, orienting, and executive  
824 function. *Neuropsychology, Development, and Cognition. Section B, Aging,*  
825 *Neuropsychology and Cognition*, 14(4), 353–369.  
826 <https://doi.org/10.1080/13825580600788837>
- 827 Jimura, K., & Braver, T. S. (2010). Age-Related Shifts in Brain Activity Dynamics during  
828 Task Switching. *Cerebral Cortex*, 20(6), 1420–1431.  
829 <https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhp206>
- 830 Jimura, K., Locke, H. S., & Braver, T. S. (2010). Prefrontal cortex mediation of cognitive  
831 enhancement in rewarding motivational contexts. *Proceedings of the National*  
832 *Academy of Sciences*, 107(19), 8871–8876. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1002007107>
- 833 Kingstone, A., Klein, R., Morein-Zamir, S., Hunt, A., Fisk, J., & Maxner, C. (2002).  
834 Orienting attention in aging and Parkinson's disease: Distinguishing modes of control.  
835 *Journal of Clinical and Experimental Neuropsychology*, 24(7), 951–967.  
836 <https://doi.org/10.1076/jcen.24.7.951.8387>
- 837 Klein, C., Fischer, B., Hartnegg, K., Heiss, W. H., & Roth, M. (2000). Optomotor and  
838 neuropsychological performance in old age. *Experimental Brain Research*, 135(2),  
839 141–154. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s002210000506>
- 840 Kolodny, T., Mevorach, C., & Shalev, L. (2017). Isolating response inhibition in the brain:  
841 Parietal versus frontal contribution. *Cortex*, 88, 173–185.



- 842 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2016.12.012>
- 843 Kramer, A. F., Humphrey, D. G., Larish, J. F., & Logan, G. D. (1994). Aging and inhibition:  
844 Beyond a unitary view of inhibitory processing in attention. *Psychology and Aging*,  
845 9(4), 491–512. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0882-7974.9.4.491>
- 846 Langley, L. K., Friesen, C. K., Saville, A. L., & Ciernia, A. T. (2011). Timing of reflexive  
847 visuospatial orienting in young, young-old, and old-old adults. *Attention, Perception,*  
848 *and Psychophysics*, 73(5), 1546–1561. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13414-011-0108-8>
- 849 Langley, L. K., Gayzur, N. D., Saville, A. L., Morlock, S. L., & Bagne, A. G. (2011). Spatial  
850 distribution of attentional inhibition is not altered in healthy aging. *Attention,*  
851 *Perception, and Psychophysics*, 73(3), 766–783. [https://doi.org/10.3758/s13414-010-](https://doi.org/10.3758/s13414-010-0059-5)  
852 0059-5
- 853 Larson, M. J., Clayson, P. E., Keith, C. M., Hunt, I. J., Hedges, D. W., Nielsen, B. L., & Call,  
854 V. R. A. (2016). Cognitive control adjustments in healthy older and younger adults:  
855 Conflict adaptation, the error-related negativity (ERN), and evidence of generalized  
856 decline with age. *Biological Psychology*, 115, 50–63.  
857 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsycho.2016.01.008>
- 858 Li, S.-C., Lindenberger, U., & Sikström, S. (2001). Aging cognition: from neuromodulation  
859 to representation. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 5(11), 479–486.  
860 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1364-6613\(00\)01769-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1364-6613(00)01769-1)
- 861 Li, T., Yao, Y., Cheng, Y., Xu, B., Cao, X., Waxman, D., ... Feng, J. (2016). Cognitive  
862 training can reduce the rate of cognitive aging: a neuroimaging cohort study. *BMC*  
863 *Geriatrics*, 16, 12. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12877-016-0194-5>
- 864 Lustig, C., Hasher, L., & Zacks, R. T. (2007). Inhibitory deficit theory: Recent developments  
865 in a “new view.” *Inhibition in Cognition*, 17, 145–162.
- 866 Mahoney, J. R., Verghese, J., Goldin, Y., Lipton, R., & Holtzer, R. (2010). Alerting,

- 867 orienting, and executive attention in older adults. *Journal of the International*  
 868 *Neuropsychological Society: JINS*, 16(5), 877–889.  
 869 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1355617710000767>
- 870 Mayas, J., Fuentes, L. J., & Ballesteros, S. (2012). Stroop interference and negative priming  
 871 (NP) suppression in normal aging. *Archives of Gerontology and Geriatrics*, 54(2),  
 872 333–338. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.archger.2010.12.012>
- 873 Mecklinger, A., Weber, K., Gunter, T. C., & Engle, R. W. (2003). Dissociable brain  
 874 mechanisms for inhibitory control: effects of interference content and working  
 875 memory capacity. *Cognitive Brain Research*, 18(1), 26–38.  
 876 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cogbrainres.2003.08.008>
- 877 Mevorach, C., Spaniol, M. M., Soden, M., & Galea, J. M. (2016). Age-dependent distractor  
 878 suppression across the vision and motor domain. *Journal of Vision*, 16(11), 27.  
 879 <https://doi.org/10.1167/16.11.27>
- 880 Monge, Z. A., & Madden, D. J. (2016). Linking Cognitive and Visual Perceptual Decline in  
 881 Healthy Aging: The Information Degradation Hypothesis. *Neuroscience and*  
 882 *Biobehavioral Reviews*, 69, 166–173. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2016.07.031>
- 883 Morse, C. K. (1993). Does variability increase with age? An archival study of cognitive  
 884 measures. *Psychology and Aging*, 8(2), 156–164.
- 885 Olk, B., & Kingstone, A. (2009). A new look at aging and performance in the antisaccade  
 886 task: The impact of response selection. *European Journal of Cognitive Psychology*,  
 887 21(2–3), 406–427. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09541440802333190>
- 888 Owsley, C. (2016). Vision and Aging. *Annual Review of Vision Science*, 2(1), 255–271.  
 889 <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-vision-111815-114550>
- 890 Pardhan, S. (2004). Contrast sensitivity loss with aging: sampling efficiency and equivalent  
 891 noise at different spatial frequencies. *JOSA A*, 21(2), 169–175.

- 892 <https://doi.org/10.1364/JOSAA.21.000169>
- 893 Paxton, J. L., Barch, D. M., Racine, C. A., & Braver, T. S. (2008). Cognitive Control, Goal  
894 Maintenance, and Prefrontal Function in Healthy Aging. *Cerebral Cortex*, 18(5),  
895 1010–1028. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhm135>
- 896 Polich, J. (2007). Updating P300: An Integrative Theory of P3a and P3b. *Clinical*  
897 *Neurophysiology : Official Journal of the International Federation of Clinical*  
898 *Neurophysiology*, 118(10), 2128–2148. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2007.04.019>
- 899 Porto, F. H. G., Tusch, E. S., Fox, A. M., Alperin, B., Holcomb, P. J., & Daffner, K. R.  
900 (2016). One of the most well-established age-related changes in neural activity  
901 disappears after controlling for visual acuity. *NeuroImage*, 130, 115–122.  
902 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2016.01.035>
- 903 Puccioni, O., & Vallesi, A. (2012). Conflict resolution and adaptation in normal aging: The  
904 role of verbal intelligence and cognitive reserve. *Psychology and Aging*, 27(4), 1018.  
905 <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029106>
- 906 Rey-Mermet, A., & Gade, M. (2018). Inhibition in aging: What is preserved? What declines?  
907 A meta-analysis. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 25(5), 1695–1716.  
908 <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13423-017-1384-7>
- 909 Rey-Mermet, A., Gade, M., & Oberauer, K. (2018). Should we stop thinking about  
910 inhibition? Searching for individual and age differences in inhibition ability. *Journal*  
911 *of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 44(4), 501–526.  
912 <https://doi.org/10.1037/xlm0000450>
- 913 Roberts, K. L., & Allen, H. A. (2016). Perception and Cognition in the Ageing Brain: A Brief  
914 Review of the Short- and Long-Term Links between Perceptual and Cognitive  
915 Decline. *Frontiers in Aging Neuroscience*, 8.  
916 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnagi.2016.00039>

- 917 Ross, R. G., Olincy, A., Harris, J. G., Radant, A., Adler, L. E., Compagnon, N., & Freedman,  
 918 R. (1999). The effects of age on a smooth pursuit tracking task in adults with  
 919 schizophrenia and normal subjects. *Biological Psychiatry*, 46(3), 383–391.  
 920 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0006-3223\(98\)00369-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0006-3223(98)00369-2)
- 921 Salthouse, T.A. (1994). The Aging of Working Memory. *Neuropsychology*, 8(4), 535–543.
- 922 Salthouse, Timothy A. (1996). The processing-speed theory of adult age differences in  
 923 cognition. *Psychological Review*, 103(3), 403–428. [https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-](https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.103.3.403)  
 924 295X.103.3.403
- 925 Salthouse, Timothy A. (2000). Aging and measures of processing speed. *Biological*  
 926 *Psychology*, 54(1–3), 35–54. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0301-0511\(00\)00052-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0301-0511(00)00052-1)
- 927 Salthouse, Timothy A., & Meinzig, E. J. (1995). Aging, Inhibition, Working Memory, and  
 928 Speed. *The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social*  
 929 *Sciences*, 50B(6), P297–P306. <https://doi.org/10.1093/geronb/50B.6.P297>
- 930 Sebastian, A., Baldemann, C., Feige, B., Katzev, M., Scheller, E., Hellwig, B., ... Klöppel,  
 931 S. (2013). Differential effects of age on subcomponents of response inhibition.  
 932 *Neurobiology of Aging*, 34(9), 2183–2193.  
 933 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neurobiolaging.2013.03.013>
- 934 Sekuler, R., & Hutman, L. P. (1980). Spatial Vision and Aging. I: Contrast Sensitivity.  
 935 *Journal of Gerontology*, 35(5), 692–699. <https://doi.org/10.1093/geronj/35.5.692>
- 936 Strauss, G. P., Allen, D. N., Jorgensen, M. L., & Cramer, S. L. (2005). Test-Retest Reliability  
 937 of Standard and Emotional Stroop Tasks: An Investigation of Color-Word and  
 938 Picture-Word Versions. *Assessment*, 12(3), 330–337.  
 939 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1073191105276375>
- 940 Stroop, J. R. (1935). Studies of interference in serial verbal reactions. *Journal of*  
 941 *Experimental Psychology*, 18(6), 643–662. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0054651>

- 942 Studebaker, G. A. (1985). A Rationalized Arcsine Transform. *Journal of Speech, Language,*  
 943 *and Hearing Research*, 28. <https://doi.org/10.1044/jshr.2803.455>
- 944 Swick, D., Ashley, V., & Turken, U. (2011). Are the neural correlates of stopping and not  
 945 going identical? Quantitative meta-analysis of two response inhibition tasks.  
 946 *NeuroImage*, 56(3), 1655–1665. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2011.02.070>
- 947 Titz, C., Behrendt, J., Menge, U., & Hasselhorn, M. (2008). A Reassessment of Negative  
 948 Priming Within the Inhibition Framework of Cognitive Aging: There Is More in It  
 949 Than Previously Believed. *Experimental Aging Research*, 34(4), 340–366.  
 950 <https://doi.org/10.1080/03610730802273936>
- 951 Tsvetanov, K. A., Mevorach, C., Allen, H., & Humphreys, G. W. (2013). Age-related  
 952 differences in selection by visual saliency. *Attention, Perception, & Psychophysics*,  
 953 75(7), 1382–1394. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13414-013-0499-9>
- 954 Vadaga, K. K., Blair, M., & Li, K. Z. H. (2016). Are Age-Related Differences Uniform  
 955 Across Different Inhibitory Functions? *The Journals of Gerontology Series B:*  
 956 *Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, 71(4), 641–649.  
 957 <https://doi.org/10.1093/geronb/gbv002>
- 958 Verhaeghen, P., & Cerella, J. (2002). Aging, executive control, and attention: a review of  
 959 meta-analyses. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, 26(7), 849–857.  
 960 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0149-7634\(02\)00071-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0149-7634(02)00071-4)
- 961 Verhaeghen, P., & De Meersman, L. (1998). Aging and the Stroop effect: A meta-analysis.  
 962 *Psychology and Aging*, 13(1), 120–126. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0882-7974.13.1.120>
- 963 Warren, D. E., Thurtell, M. J., Carroll, J. N., & Wall, M. (2013). Perimetric evaluation of  
 964 saccadic latency, saccadic accuracy, and visual threshold for peripheral visual stimuli  
 965 in young compared with older adults. *Investigative Ophthalmology and Visual*  
 966 *Science*, 54(8), 5778–5787. <https://doi.org/10.1167/iovs.13-12032>

- 967 Waszak, F., Li, S.-C., & Hommel, B. (2010). The development of attentional networks:  
 968 Cross-sectional findings from a life span sample. *Developmental Psychology*, 46(2),  
 969 337–349. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018541>
- 970 West, R., & Moore, K. (2005). Adjustments of Cognitive Control in Younger and Older  
 971 Adults. *Cortex*, 41(4), 570–581. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0010-9452\(08\)70197-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0010-9452(08)70197-7)
- 972 Xiang, L., Zhang, B., Wang, B., Jiang, J., Zhang, F., & Hu, Z. (2016). The Effect of Aging on  
 973 the Dynamics of Reactive and Proactive Cognitive Control of Response Interference.  
 974 *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01640>
- 975 Zanto, T. P., Toy, B., & Gazzaley, A. (2010). Delays in neural processing during working  
 976 memory encoding in normal aging. *Neuropsychologia*, 48(1), 13–25.  
 977 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2009.08.003>
- 978 Zhang, J. X., Wu, R., Kong, L., Weng, X., & Du, Y. (2010). Electrophysiological correlates  
 979 of proactive interference in the ‘Recent Probes’ verbal working memory task.  
 980 *Neuropsychologia*, 48(7), 2167–2173.  
 981 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2010.04.008>